



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,741	02/18/2000	Victor S Lobanov	1503.0730000	7797
7590	12/24/2003		EXAMINER	
Vicki G. Norton PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP 11682 El Camino Real Suite 100 San Diego, CA 92130-2092			MARSCHEL, ARDIN H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1631	
DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SPM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/506,741

Applicant(s)

LOBANOV ET AL.

Examiner

Ardin Marschel

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,7-27 and 31-48 is/are pending in the application.
~~4a) Other than the above claim(s) 4-6 and 28-30 have been canceled. 4b) Claims with drawing(s) withdrawn from consideration.~~

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3,7-27 and 31-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 16.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Due to the below summarized new ground of rejection, the finality of the office action, mailed 6/26/03, is hereby withdrawn.

Applicants' arguments, filed 10/27/03, have been fully considered and they are deemed to be persuasive to overcome the previous rejections of record. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. Upon reconsideration, the following rejections and/or objections are newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

SCOPE OF ENABLEMENT

Claims 1-3 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods which are limited to at least requiring the selection of M compounds out of N enumerated compounds via a fitness function, does not reasonably provide enablement for methods without any fitness function selection requirement. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make/use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples,

(4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The Board also stated that although the level of skill in molecular biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

The first sentence describing the instant invention in the specification on page 8, lines 2-4, requires the practice of fitness functions for compound selection. It is noted that instant claim 1 lacks any limitation or requirement for a fitness function selection practice. The specification on pages 14-17 go on at length about selection criteria which are interpreted as fitness function criteria. In the exemplified methodology on page 19, lines 7-8, of the specification a fitness function selection is set forth. Without some type of fitness function for compound selection the purpose of outputting a library is unknown and/or unlimited as to what the library's usage is. In instant claim 1, parts (e) and (f), a focused library is set forth, however, the only way that such a focused is predictably available is via some type of fitness function selection process. Part (c) of claim 1, cites selecting practice without any limitation as to how this is performed. Without some type of fitness function criteria for selection, the resultant library analysis lacks connection with some type of useful result and therefore is unpredictable as to what it may be used for. Such unpredictability supports this rejection based on a lack of enabled usage for library analysis methods as claimed which are not limited to requiring

some type of fitness function(s) selection criteria. The above listed claims are not limited to requiring such a fitness function(s) practice.

VAGUENESS AND INDEFINITENESS

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24, last line, cites the phrase “the fitness function” which lacks antecedent basis anywhere earlier in the claim. It is noted that a missing phrase may exist at the end of line 9 of claim 24. Clarification via clearer claim wording is requested.

NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3, 7-27, and 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Consideration of the “Computer-Related Inventions” section of the MPEP at section 2106, Part IV, subpart B, has revealed that the above listed instant claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter without requiring performance of a result outside of a computer. Thus, the manipulation of data or conversion of data, in this case manipulation of virtual libraries is the claimed subject matter without any physical transformation outside of the computer. It is noted that the last 2 lines of instant claim 1 cites the outputting of results data but without requiring any outside of the computer

output. For example, it is well known that a software program may output results to a computer file and not display it, for example, outside of the computer.

No claim is allowed.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703)308-3894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703)308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703)305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

December 19, 2003


ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
TECHNICAL CENTER 1600
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE